

PRESENTATIONS FOR THE SPECIAL TOWN MEETING OF JUNE 20, 2006

ARTICLE 2: SPECIAL FUND TRANSFER TO NEW TOWN HALL BUILDING ACCOUNT

A: History and Usage of Funds:

1. Police Station Building Account was created via Article 12 of the May 10, 2005 ATM.
New fund comprised of:
 - a. Police Station Building Account - \$40,679.90
 - b. High School Steps/Roof account - \$74,221.00
 - c. Capital Improvement Trust Fund - \$3,533.22
 - d. Highway Garage Account - \$13,565.88
 - e. Total - \$132,000.00
2. Intent & Current Situation
 - a. The intent of the original article was to build out the second floor of the Police Station for School Department Administration "Central Office" office space.
 - b. Funds have sat idle since the project was scratched
 - c. There are currently no plans to improve the Second Floor of the Police Station
 - d. Funds need to be transferred in order to be used
 - e. No additional appropriation requested
3. Usage of Existing Funds
 - a. Majority of funds in this account are surplus bond proceeds
 - b. MGL Chapter 44, Section 20A states that surplus proceeds of bonded projects may be used for any other purposes for an equal or longer period of time than that for which the original loan was issued
 - c. Funds may not be used for maintenance or operating budget purposes

B: Movement of School District Offices

1. School Department (Current)
 - a. Current location: 15 Mendon Street
 - b. School Dept rents this space for \$21,600 per year plus utilities
 - c. Building is up for sale.
 - d. Office layout is poor
2. Proposed School Department move
 - a. Office to relocate to modular offices in Upper Town Hall (UTH)
 - b. Full module measures 55 feet wide by 36 feet deep
 - c. Contains 7 closed offices, 3 open space work areas plus hallways
 - d. These are no office partitions; full module will have walls, ceilings, carpet, doors, etc.
 - e. Two new large portable air conditioning units
 - f. Will be staffed by 6 full time employees, remainder of Central Office staff (7) travels District-wide but will use office space
3. Condition of Upper Town Hall
 - a. Has been inspected by both the Town Building Inspector and State Building Inspector

- b. Found to be structurally sound
 - c. Office modules apply 50 PSI to the floor; UTH will support 100 PSI
 - d. Inexpensive signage, lighting, handrails and door improvements are only issues to be corrected
- 4. Estimated cost of move:
 - a. Modular Office purchase - \$63,210
 - b. 2 - 42,000 BTU Mobile Cool Units - \$10,780
 - c. Electrical/Heat improvements - \$10,000
 - d. Telephone & Cable lines - \$3,000
 - e. Moving of furniture, office equipment and files - \$7,000
 - f. Carpeting - \$4,520
 - g. Carpentry - \$1,000
 - h. Total estimated cost \$99,510
 - i. Presently bids have been received for 2/3rds of the project (itemized above) and have come in at \$2,000 below estimate
- 5. Benefits to the move
 - a. Puts unused Town Hall space to good use
 - b. Allows School Department to save \$21,600 per year, plus % of utilities
 - c. Allows town and school departments time to effectively plan a permanent location for school offices
 - d. Allows for shared resources, such as technology and networking
 - e. Provides for expansion; Town Hall gains additional office use of modules/storage space when school department moves to permanent location.
- 6. ADA issues (See Article 3)
 - a. Current Central Office location not at all handicap accessible
 - b. Town Hall first floor currently partially accessible (more improvements planned)
 - c. Movement to the Town Hall will allow handicapped access to the School Department via first floor meetings
 - d. This solution offers more potential ADA accommodations than the leased space
- 7. Endorsements
 - a. Project has the support of the Town Manager and School Superintendent; a formal voted to support by the School Committee and Finance Committee
 - b. Use of bond proceeds endorsed by DOR, Bond Counsel and Financial Advisor
 - c. Condition of UTH structurally compliant with State Building Code as confirmed and endorsed by two Building Inspectors, some minor modifications to UTH will occur
 - d. We are hoping Town Meeting will endorse the fund transfer

ARTICLE 3: SPECIAL FUND TRANSFER TO NEW ADA COMPLIANCE ACCOUNT

I ADA Compliance - Currently

- 1. Town Hall is currently two-thirds compliant with ADA on the first floor
 - a. We have an entrance ramp from the outside and compliant bathrooms
 - b. No handicap access to Selectmen's hearing room or Town Manager's office
 - c. Second floor is not at all accessible

2. Purpose of the request

- a. Town Hall ADA elevator account is insufficiently funded and exists only for construction of an elevator
- b. ADA Compliance Committee is not active
- c. Combination of the funds and broadening of their purpose will allow for more handicap accessible improvements to be made

3. Town Hall Elevator

- a. Estimated Cost: \$200,000 - \$225,000 (unconfirmed)
- b. Could be stationed in vacant former Town Clerk's Office and run to Town Accountant's office on the second floor.
- c. Would also require the removal of the Conservation Office and a retrofit of those offices into one common open space in order to gain handicapped access to the right side of the second floor
- d. Need design study

4. Impediments to installing a new elevator in Short-term

- a. Funds are not currently available to install the elevator and redo the second floor offices
- b. Office space and document storage space is greatly needed; the elevator eliminates three rooms in Town Hall
- c. The Town has not evaluated its building inventory, future office needs and acquisition plans

5. Conclusion

- a. These funds will only be spent on ADA compliance
- b. Combining these funds allows us to make some critical small cap improvements on the first floor of Town Hall
- c. The elevator installation will be under serious consideration; more information is needed before this project is undertaken

ARTICLE 11: TRANSFER/SALE/PURCHASE -DOUGLAS STREET PROPERTY

I History

1. Parcel was taken for 1989/1990 taxes – Instrument of Taking recorded in November 21, 1990 in Box 13202, Page 57
2. FY 1991 – 1994 taxes certified to the account
3. Total taking amounted to \$15,949.10
4. Final judgment recorded in Book 15968, Page 181 on Jan 12, 1994
5. Petition filed on December 24, 2002 by Louis Tusino, claiming one of the owners of the property, Luie Belle Daubney was not properly notified by the Land Court during foreclosure proceedings. Tusino had obtained a deed of her interest in the property (original judgment recorded on January 12, 1994 (Book # 15968, Page 181). The Land Court agreed with Tusino, and issued an order to vacate judgment on ½ of the parcel on February 5, 2003 (Case Number 92184).

II Options

1. Town can do nothing, leaving the property as is
 - a. If contested by Tusino, we can start a taking of his interest via eminent domain, at substantial cost

2. Treasurer can dispose of Town's ½ interest at public auction
 - a. As it is only a ½ interest, and the property is landlocked, Tusino and maybe abutters are likely to be the only bidders
 - b. In doing so, unless deed restricted, the Town will lose control of what is done with the property
3. Town Meeting can transfer custody to the Board of Selectmen
 - a. Allows the Town Manager, BOS and Town Council to negotiate the best opportunity for the Town without the hostility of an eminent domain taking
 - b. Not absolute, as is an auction, either side can discontinue or change negotiations at any time
 - c. Allows for more flexibility in attempting to get the property back on the tax rolls

ARTICLE 12: REZONING [Douglas Street] Map Attached

I Economics

1. FY 2006 Tax Levy: 16,436,117.04
 - a. Residential: 14,704,020.40 (89.46%) 5,166 parcels
 - b. Comm/Ind: 1,309,293.85 (7.96%) 391 parcels
 - c. Personal Prop: 422,802.79 (2.57%) 292 entities
2. FY 2007 budget – 4 areas of growth
 - a. Prop 2 ½ increase - \$389,772
 - b. New growth - \$630,000
 - c. State Aid - \$385,442
 - d. Local receipts - \$214,953
 - Total: \$1,620,167
3. Development possibilities – 3 options
 - a. Commercial Development
 - b. Housing Development
 - c. No development
4. Commercial Development
 - a. Serendipity parcel generated \$9,517.46 in tax revenue for FY 2006
 - b. Jointly owned parcel generated \$1,044.47 in tax revenue for FY 2006
 - c. Developer forecasted revenue of both parcels at build out \$431,600
5. Economics of not rezoning
 - a. Serendipity will likely house a smaller development if parcels are not rezoned
 - b. Serendipity is the most viable entrance way to the proposed development
 - c. Without that visible entryway, the parcel is likely not to be developed commercially
 - d. The second entry point, through the Tusino land, would only allow for housing development as currently zoned
 1. Average tax bill in Uxbridge is \$3,440
 2. Average per pupil expenditure in Uxbridge is over \$5,000
 3. Cost on 20 housing units with 2 children each - \$200,000
 - a. Less tax revenue (20 units * 4,000) = 80,000
 - b. Net loss (200,000 – 80,000) = \$120,000
 4. Cost 100 units with 2 children (40B) - \$1,000,000

- a. Less tax revenue (90 Units * 300,000)
+ (10 units * 150,000) = \$307,515
- b. Net loss (\$1,000,000 – \$307,515) = \$692,485

6. What's New since last ATM:

- a. Town sponsored article
- b. Economic Analysis
- c. Possible resolution of joint tenant (ownership) of parcel
- d. Voted support of FinComm and Planning Board

7. Summation

- a. Commercial use is the best use of the property
- b. Area will still be impacted by commercial growth at Serendipity
- c. Any new housing development with children will adversely Town finances
- d. No windfall on sale of town's interest; possible new expenditure in buying Tusino's interest
- e. If the Town owns the land, negotiations with other property owners will be needed in order to get access
- f. New commercial tax revenue helps the tax base